

clearly indicates the intent and purpose of the United States to exercise jurisdiction over the lands involved. However, jurisdiction would not vest in the United States until such notice of acceptance is received by the Governor of the State wherein the land is situated. The officer accepting jurisdiction on behalf of the United States should, therefore, request and obtain from the Governor of the State a formal acknowledgment of the receipt of the Government's acceptance of jurisdiction. This might become a convenient means of proof in a case where an issue has been made as to the exact time the United States acquired jurisdiction over the lands concerned.

26. Non-acceptance of jurisdiction by United States over lands acquired prior to act of February 1, 1940, may be shown by circumstances.—Little difficulty should be experienced in establishing the jurisdictional status of lands acquired by the United States since enactment of the act of Congress approved February 1, 1940, *supra*. However, the presumption of non-acceptance of jurisdiction created by the act, as now written into Section 355, as amended, does not apply to lands acquired prior to February 1, 1940. It, therefore, may be expected that perplexing problems will continue to arise with respect to such lands because there seldom will be any formal or record proof of acceptance of jurisdiction by the Federal Government.

As pointed out above, in the absence of evidence indicating that the United States does not intend to exercise jurisdiction over such lands acceptance of jurisdiction may be presumed. It is not necessary, however, that such intent should be made known by any affirmative act on the part of the Government in declining jurisdiction. This may be shown by circumstances. It was held by the Supreme Court of the United States that any intention on the part of the Government to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over lands acquired in the State of Washington for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam was negated by the fact that the Government's contract for its construction provided that the contractor should comply with all laws and regulations of the State of Washington which affect the building, maintenance and operation of the contractor's camp, as well as with all health laws of the State, and also that the contractor shall make arrangements with State and County authorities for school facilities and police protection.³

27. Requirement that Government contractor comply with State laws, effect of.—In an Oregon case involving jurisdiction over lands acquired for the Bonneville Dam project, the major part of the dam structure was built upon lands in the bed of the Columbia River, to which the United States had not acquired title.

³ *Mason v. Tax Commission*, 302 U. S. 186, 209, 58 S. Ct. 233.